

IN THE CLAIMS

Below are the claims pending in the application, including current amendments as indicated:

1-61 (Cancelled)

62. (Currently amended) A security device for use inside an automatic teller machine, the security device being capable of communicating with a security system of a transportation means used to deliver a cash cassette to the automatic teller machine, said security device comprising a coupling device for engaging with the cash cassette delivered to the automatic teller machine, spoiling means for spoiling the contents of the cash cassette and a controller, in which a monitor is provided to signal when the cash cassette has correctly coupled to the security device and that a delivery path for delivering the spoiling means has not been tampered with, the security device communicating with the security system of the transportation means used to deliver the cash cassette to the automatic teller machine, the security system verifying that the cassette has been delivered to a predesignated automatic teller machine and inhibiting the transportation means from releasing the cash cassette if the delivery path has been tampered with or the cassette has not reached the predesignated automatic teller machine.

63. (Previously presented) The security device as claimed in claim 62, in which the controller is arranged to establish communication with the automatic teller machine so that an attack on the automatic teller machine can be signaled to the security device in order that the spoiling means can be operated to spoil the contents of the cash cassette.

64. (Original) The security device as claimed in claim 62, in which the security device is arranged to signal to the automatic teller machine when it has correctly coupled with the cash cassette and has taken over responsibility for protecting the contents of the cassette.

65 (Original) The security device as claimed in claim 62, in which the spoiling means comprises a reservoir of ink which can be ejected under pressure via a fluid flow coupling into the cash cassette to degrade the contents thereof.

66. (Original) The security device as claimed in claim 65, in which the reservoir and the controller are contained within an enclosure containing penetration detection means.

67. (Original) The security device as claimed in claim 66, in which the penetration detection means comprises at least one conductor arranged to traverse an element that is to be monitored

for penetration, such that penetration of the element causes damage to the at least one conductor thereby altering its electrical properties.

68-122 (Cancelled)

123. (Currently Amended) A cash transit container security system, comprising spoiling means for spoiling the contents of a cash cassette temporarily connected to the cash transit container security system in the event of an attack on the cash cassette wherein the cash transit container security system further comprises locking means for locking the cash transit container security system onto the cash cassette to be protected during transportation, control means for controlling the operation of the locking means and the spoiling means, and communication means for exchanging data with an automated automatic teller machine security system such that the cash transit container security system can validate with the automatic teller machine security system that the cash cassette has been delivered to a prior designated automatic teller machine and either one of the cash transit container security systems or the prior designated automatic teller machine security system is protecting the cash cassette before the other one of the cash transit container security systems or automatic teller machine security system relinquishes responsibility for protecting the cash cassette.

124. (Previously presented) The cash transit container security system as claimed in claim 123, further including the capability to communicate with a vehicle for delivering the cash cassette, the vehicle including a controller which controls the release of the cash cassette from the vehicle and which exchanges data with the control means.

125. (Previously presented) The cash transit container security system as claimed in claim 123, further including means for communicating with the security system of a vehicle used for delivering the cash cassette, the vehicle including a second controller which controls the release of the cash cassette from the vehicle, and wherein the cash transit container security system negotiates with the second controller to control the release of cash cassette from the vehicle.

126. (Previously presented) The cash transit container security system as claimed in claim 124, characterized in that the locking means locks around one of an opening of the cash cassette or an adapter mounted on the cash cassette.

127. (Cancelled)

128. (Previously presented) The cash transit container as claimed in claim 123, characterized by a first module containing the control means and a second module containing the locking

means, and in which the spoiling means is contained within one of the first and second modules.

129. (Cancelled)

130. (Previously presented) The cash transit container security system as claimed in claim 123 characterized in that the security system is programmed with the identity of one or more cash cassettes and each automatic teller machine which is scheduled for a cash delivery within a predetermined time period.

131. (Previously presented)) The cash transit container security system as claimed in claim 123, wherein the control means is arranged to measure at least one of walk time, distance traveled, and absolute time since release of the cash cassette from the automatic teller machine security system and to activate the spoiling if any of these exceeds a preset threshold.

132. (Previously presented) The cash transit container security system as claimed in claim 123, characterized in that the control means is arranged to communicate with an automatic teller machine to validate identities and to exchange data concerning the value and/or denomination of money being transferred to or from the cash transit container security system and the automatic teller machine.

133. (Cancelled)

134. (Previously presented) The cash transit container security system as claimed in claim 123, wherein that the control means is arranged to pass encryption or decryption keys to an automatic teller machine.

135 (Cancelled)

136. (Previously presented) The cash transit container security system as claimed in claim 123, characterized in that the spoiling means includes at least one dye reservoir for delivering dye, and one of a compressed gas cylinder, a chemical delivery system for generating gas, and explosive delivery system or a mechanical system for causing the dye to be expelled from the at least one reservoir.

137. (Cancelled)

REMARKS

The application now comprises claims 62-67, 123-126, 128, 130-132, 134 and 136, claims 62 and 123 being hereby amended.

Claims 123, 124, 125, 130, 132 and 134 were objected to as containing informalities. In claim 123 "automated" has been changed to --automatic--, so that "automatic" is used consistently. It was also indicated that the automatic teller machine, vehicle and vehicle controller and vehicle second controller were not positively claimed and it was questioned whether they are part of the claimed. The claimed invention is directed to a cash transit container security system (referred to as "CTCSS" for the purposes of this response) comprising a) a spoiling means for spoiling the contents of a cash cassette, b) locking means for attaching the security system to the cash cassette, and c) communication means for exchanging data with devices outside the security system, namely and ATM, vehicle controller or second vehicle controller, to determine if whether the CTCSS or the ATM (claim 123), a controller in a vehicle (claim 124, or a second controller in a vehicle (claim 125), has protective custody of the cassette before being released by the CTCSS. The ATM, vehicle, vehicle controller or second vehicle controller are not part of the CTCSS.

Claims 62-67, 123, 128, 130-132, 134 and 136 were rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Cassidy et al, US Patent 5,615,625, in that Cassidy teaches a security system including a microcontroller in Fig. 1 for a lockable container which includes spoiling means, the system monitoring the container between first and second locations as well as in transit, and Cassidy can be programmed to activate a dye dispenser upon tampering. Further, the examiner contended that the limitations in applicant's claim 123 are structurally unsupported functional limitations.

Applicant respectfully submits that Cassidy does not anticipate or render obvious the claimed invention as set forth in the presently amended claims. In support thereof, the examiner's attention is directed to the following explanation of certain portions of applicant's claim 62, as amended, those portions being set forth below, and the differences from Cassidy.

63. ...the security device being capable of communicating with a security system of a transportation means used to deliver a cash cassette to the automatic teller machine,... and a controller, in which a monitor is provided to signal when the cash cassette has correctly coupled to the security device and that the delivery path for delivering the spoiling means has not been tampered with,... the security

device communicating with the security system of the transportation means used to deliver the cash cassette to the automatic teller machine, the security system verifying that the cassette has been delivered to a predesignated automatic teller machine and inhibiting the transportation means from releasing the cash cassette if the delivery path has been tampered with or the cassette has not reached the predesignated automatic teller machine.

This language requires communication between the security device in the ATM and the transportation means (a carrier) for the cassette. While communication is indicated to exist in Cassidy, it is limited and one way. There is no suggestion that the security system in the Cassidy cassette transportation system is able to communicate with the ATM to verify that it is delivered to the designated ATM. Instead, in Cassidy the ATM security system merely transmits a prior received access code to the cassette security device to open the device. A major flaw in the Cassidy system is that transmission of the access code from the loading terminal to the receiving location, which could be an ATM, can be electronically intercepted and unencrypted and the cassette could be opened at any location by anyone having the access code. Applicant's claimed security arrangement is far more secure and has a greater protection against interception. In applicant's claimed invention the ATM, or any other cassette receiving location, such as a bank receiving a full cassette sent from an ATM, would have a unique identification code. Prior to transporting the cassette from a first location to a second location the security system in the cassette carrier is provided with the unique identification code of the receiving location. When the cassette arrives at that second location, such as an ATM, the security device in the ATM communicates with the security system in the carrier for the cassette and the delivery to the prior designated location is verified by use of the designated location unique identification code. This is set forth at least at page 26, lines 17-20 of the specification. If the cassette is delivered to the wrong location or an attempt is made to access the cassette at other than the designated location, the security system spoils the contents, preventing use of the stolen contents. In other words Cassidy transmits the access code to the destination, allowing interception of the code. In applicant's claimed invention the access code rides with the cassette, can not be intercepted and the cassette can only be opened if it arrives at the proper location in the manner designated. The issue is not whether the security systems can communicate with each other. A clear and patentable distinction between the claimed invention and the cited reference is the nature of the information communicated between the security systems. The manner of operation and

the information communicated by applicant provides a much greater level of security from that shown or suggested by Cassidy.

It is therefore strongly asserted that Cassidy does not teach all of the limitations of claim 62 as amended and does not have the same structural features or operate in the same way as the claimed invention.

As regards the Examiner's objection to claim 123, the above arguments apply to claim 123 as amended in that Cassidy does not teach the establishment of a hand shaking protocol to ensure that one of the security systems is protecting the container before the other security system which had previously been protecting the contents of the container relinquishes responsibility for that task. Claim 123 as amended relates to a security system for a cash transit container where the cash transit container locks onto a cash cassette which is temporarily connected to it for delivery to an ATM. The security system of the cash transit container negotiates with the ATM system in order to ensure that the cassette has been delivered to the designated ATM system and that system has secured control of the container before the cash transit container's security system relinquishes its responsibility.

Accordingly claims 62 and 123 are clearly not shown or suggested by the cited reference and are allowable. The remaining claims are all dependent on either claim 62 or claim 123, and are therefore likewise patentable.

Claims 124-126 were rejected under 35 USC §103 as being obvious based on Cassidy et al in light of Boutroy et al, US Patent 4,799,435 in that Boutroy et al teaches locking and monitoring a container in a transit vehicle and it would be obvious to modify Cassidy to include the locking feature within the vehicle. The arguments set forth above distinguish the claimed invention over Cassidy et al. and are hereby reasserted. As claim 123 is patentably distinct from Cassidy, then claims 124-126 dependent thereon are also patentably distinct from Cassidy in combination with Boutroy. Boutroy does not provide applicant's teachings which are missing from Cassidy and if Boutroy were added to Cassidy the combination would still not render obvious applicant's claimed invention. Further, while Boutroy discloses a delivery vehicle and a releasing controller, Boutroy does not disclose or suggest that there is any communication between the cash transit container system and the vehicle. At most, Boutroy discloses a mechanism to magnetically hold a container and release the container when desired and an electrical trigger to release a spoiling material if an electrical connection to the container is broken. Still further, one skilled in the art would not combine the two teachings of the two references as the electromagnetic field utilized in Boutroy to secure the

carrying case could damage or interfere with the proper operation of the control mechanism utilized in Cassidy.

Claims 62-67, 123-126, 128, 130-132, 134 and 136 remain in the application. It is respectfully submitted that these claims are now patentable, fully supported by the Specification and not shown by the prior art and this amendment should be entered as placing the application in form for allowance or better form for appeal. It is requested that the claims be found to be patentable and a Notice of Allowance be issued.

As applicant is submitting this response to the Final Rejection within 2 months of issuance thereof and this response is being submitted by facsimile to expedite delivery to the examiner, it is respectfully requested that the response be considered in a timely manner and if any issues remain that the examiner contact the undersigned prior to the shortened deadline for response of September 7, 2004 so that further action, if necessary, can be taken prior to September 7, 2004 to avoid additional fees for extensions to the date for reply or filing an Appeal or Request for Continuing Exam.

Respectfully submitted,

August 5, 2004

By:


Michael J. Ram

Registration No. 26,379

Attorney for Applicant(s)

KOPPEL, JACOBS, PATRICK & HEYBL
555 St Charles Drive, Suite 107
Thousand Oaks, CA 91360
Phone (805) 373-0060

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE DELIVERY

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being sent by facsimile to Examiner Gall,
Lloyd A. at 703-872-9306 on

August 5, 2004
Date


Christina Nicoll